

REMARKS

Claims 12 and 28 are currently amended to clarify what Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 40, 56-57, 67-69, and 71-79 have been cancelled. Claims 13-15, 29-31, 50-52, 58-59, 61-63, 66, and 70 are currently amended to bring these claims into conformity with the language of their respective base claims, and / or to correct minor forms or informalities.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

I. Objection of claims 12-13, 28-29, 40, and 74-76.

The Office Action indicates that claims 12-13 and 28-29 stand objected to. Claims 12-13 and 28-29 have been amended to remove the alleged deficiency and to correct the informality. Claims 40 and 74-76 has been cancelled. Applicants submit that these claims as amended overcome the objection raised in the Office Action.

35 U.S.C. § 102 REJECTIONS

Claims 12, 16, 28, 32, and 41-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 5,249,231 issued on Sep. 28, 1993 to Covey et al. (hereinafter Covey.) Applicants note that “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” MPEP 2131.

I. The Office Action cites to the **Abstract, Figs. 1 and 2, col. 1, ll. 25-30, col. 2, ll. 39-66, and col. 4, ll. 35-56** of Covey and concludes that the cited figures and passages anticipate claim 12. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants first respectfully submit that Covey does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the following claimed limitations of claims 12, 28, and 88: “granting

access . . . and *modifying the third information* if . . . the second information matches . . . the third information”, wherein the third information is adapted to identify an access right.

A. Covey does not disclose or suggest the claimed limitations recited immediately above. Rather, Covey discloses a method that identifies and provides identifications to two processes and then compares these two process identifications to each other; Covey then grants the latter process’s request to “*read*” data written by another process if the two process identifications are identical. Col. 2, ll. 39-55 and col. 4, 35-45. There is nothing in Covey that discloses or suggests the combination of granting access *and* modifying the third information that is adapted to identify an access right. For at least this reason, claims 12, 28, 88, and their respective dependent claims are allowable over Covey.

B. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 80-104 are also allowable over Covey for the additional reasons that Covey does not disclose or suggest the subject matter of these claims in combination of their respective base claims.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above remarks, all claims are believed to be allowable. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. 50-2518, referencing billing number 7011575001. The Commissioner is authorized to credit any overpayment or to charge any underpayment to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. 50-2518, referencing billing number 7011575001.

Respectfully submitted,
Bingham McCutchen LLP

Dated: May 16, 2006

By: 

Erich C. Tzou

Registration No. 56,927

Three Embarcadero Center, Suite 1800
San Francisco, CA 94111-4067
Telephone: (650) 849-4962
Telefax: (650) 849-4800